

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA  
MACON DIVISION

JOHNNY CONNER NICHOLS,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	CIVIL ACTION NO. 5:11-CV-116 (MTT)
	)	
DR. EDWARD HALE BURNSIDE,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
	)	

---

**ORDER**

Before the Court is the Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration (Doc. 54) of Magistrate Judge Charles H. Weigle's Order (Doc. 50) denying the Plaintiff's Motion to Amend (Doc. 43).

Pursuant to Local Rule 7.6, "Motions for Reconsideration *shall not be filed as a matter of routine practice.*" M.D. Ga., L.R. 7.6 (emphasis added). Indeed, "[r]econsideration of a previous order is an extraordinary remedy to be employed sparingly." *Bingham v. Nelson*, 2010 WL 339806, at \*1 (M.D. Ga.) (internal quotation marks and citation omitted). It "is appropriate only if the movant demonstrates (1) that there has been an intervening change in the law, (2) that new evidence has been discovered which was not previously available to the parties in the exercise of due diligence, or (3) that the court made a clear error of law." *Id.* "In order to demonstrate clear error, the party moving for reconsideration must do more than simply restate [his] prior arguments, and any arguments which the party inadvertently failed to raise earlier

are deemed waived.” *McCoy v. Macon Water Authority*, 966 F. Supp. 1209, 1222-23 (M.D. Ga. 1997).

The Plaintiff has not met this burden. After reviewing his filings following the Magistrate Judge’s decision, it is clear the Plaintiff has not alleged an intervening change in the law nor presented new evidence previously unavailable to him. Moreover, the Court is not persuaded the Magistrate Judge’s ruling was clearly erroneous.

Accordingly, the Plaintiff’s Motion for Reconsideration is **DENIED**.

**SO ORDERED**, this 25th day of January, 2013.

S/ Marc T. Treadwell  
MARC T. TREADWELL, JUDGE  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT